

Filed on behalf of Patent Owners Genentech, Inc. and City of Hope by:

David L. Cavanaugh
Reg. No. 36,476
Owen K. Allen
Reg. No. 71,118
Heather M. Petruzzi
Reg. No. 71,270
Robert J. Gunther, Jr.
Pro Hac Vice Filed
Wilmer Cutler Pickering
Hale and Dorr LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Adam R. Brausa
Reg. No. 60,287
Daralyn J. Durie
Pro Hac Vice Filed
Durie Tangri LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

David I. Gindler
Pro Hac Vice Filed
Joseph M. Lipner
Pro Hac Vice Filed
Irell & Manella LLP
1800 Avenue of the
Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA
90067

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC. AND CITY OF HOPE,
Patent Owners

Case IPR2016-01373
Patent 6,331,415

PATENT OWNERS' PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PRIOR PROCEEDINGS	5
III. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	8
A. As Of April 1983, There Were Numerous Perceived Challenges To Producing Eukaryotic Proteins Recombinantly.	8
B. Before April 1983, Nobody Had Reported Recombinantly Producing Any Multimeric Eukaryotic Protein By Co-Expression In A Single Host Cell.	10
C. As Of April 1983, A Skilled Artisan Would Have Viewed Producing An Antibody Recombinantly As Particularly Challenging.....	12
IV. THE CABILLY '415 PATENT	17
A. The Invention.....	17
B. Industry Recognition	18
V. MERCK'S ASSERTED REFERENCES	19
A. Axel	19
B. Mulligan Papers.....	21
C. Nobel Article	24
D. Southern.....	26
E. Builder	27
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	28

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	28
VIII. ARGUMENT.....	28
A. The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	28
B. Merck Has Not Shown A Reasonable Likelihood Of Success On Any Proposed Ground.	33
1. Each proposed ground should be denied because Merck has presented no new arguments to overcome Axel's previously- determined deficiencies.....	35
a) Axel does not disclose co-expression of multiple different eukaryotic genes.....	35
b) Axel's generic reference to "antibodies" provides no guidance on how to make an antibody.....	38
2. Ground 1: Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, 19, and 33 would not have been obvious over the Mulligan papers in combination with Axel.	39
a) A person of ordinary skill would not have combined the Mulligan papers with Axel.....	45
b) A person of ordinary skill would have had no reasonable expectation of success given the uncertainties surrounding antibody production.	46
c) Axel does not disclose the recovery and assembly of functional antibodies.	48
d) The invention of the Cabilly '415 patent would not have been obvious to try.....	49
3. Ground 2: Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, 19, and 33 would not have been obvious over the Mulligan papers in combination with Axel and in further view of the Nobel article.	51

4.	Ground 3: Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, 19, and 33 would not have been obvious over the Mulligan papers in combination with Axel in further view of Builder.....	55
5.	Ground 4: Claims 1-2, 11-12, 14, 18-20, and 33 would not have been obvious over Southern in combination with Axel.	56
a)	Southern does not disclose the co-expression of antibody heavy and light chains in a single host cell.....	56
b)	A person of ordinary skill would not have combined Southern with Axel.	58
c)	Merck's remaining arguments fail for the same reasons addressed with respect to Ground 1.	59
6.	Ground 5: Claims 1-2, 11-12, 14, 18-20, and 33 would not have been obvious over Southern in combination with Axel in further view of Builder.....	61
C.	Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness Confirm The Patentability Of The Challenged Claims.....	61
D.	Merck's "Simultaneous Invention" Argument Reinforces The Patentability Of The Challenged Claims.....	65
E.	Merck's Proposed Grounds Are Duplicative.....	66
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	67

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 4205964 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 10, 2016)	45, 58
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01093, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 8, 2015)	55
<i>Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	63
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	62
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	65
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	62
<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01028, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014)	37
<i>InTouch Technologies, Inc. v. VGO Communications, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	49
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	64
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	50
<i>Monarch Knitting Machinery Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	64

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.